

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldred et al. (U.S. Patent 5,719,942) (hereinafter “Aldred”) in view of Raynak et al. (U.S. Patent 5,680,549) (hereinafter “Raynak”). Appellants traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, the cited references, alone or in combination do not teach the subject matter as recited in amended claim 1.

For example, Aldred in view of Raynak does not teach a platform independent language application passing an event port number and a command port number to a native language application. As another example, Aldred in view of Raynak does not teach the native language application opening an event notification stream to the platform independent language application on the event port, and the native language application opening a function call stream to the platform independent language application on the command port. As another example, Aldred in view of Raynak does not teach the native language application passing one or more function calls to the platform independent language application via the function call stream to invoke functions of the platform independent language application corresponding to the function calls.

Instead, Aldred specifically teaches the use of support system software together with call manager applications to establish, configure, and manage communication channels between applications, especially between applications executing on different hardware nodes (Abstract; column 1, lines 52-60). Aldred teaches that groups of

applications communicate by participating in named sharing sets. Aldred's call managers coordinate, monitor and manage the various share sets of applications. Aldred also teaches a support system and a software API through which applications interact with the call managers. Aldred's API includes functions for initiating and configuring communication between shared applications via channels and signals. However, none of the teachings of Aldred describe a platform independent language application passing an event port number and a command port number to a native language application, nor does Aldred teach the native language application opening an event notification stream to the platform independent language application on the event port, and the native language application opening a function call stream to the platform independent language application on the command port, nor does Aldred teach the native language application passing one or more function calls to the platform independent language application via the function call stream to invoke functions of the platform independent language application corresponding to the function calls.

Furthermore, Raynak does not teach the above limitations as recited in amended claim 1, and a combination of Raynak with Aldred does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Aldred.

Thus, for at least the reasons presented above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks as those above regarding claim 1 also apply to claims 12 and 20.

The Examiner rejected claims 2-6, 8-11, 13-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldred and Raynak, and in further view of Simonoff et al. (U.S. Patent 6,005,568), and claims 7 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aldred, Raynak and Simonoff, and in further view of Jalili et al. (U.S. Patent 5,423,042). Since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of these § 103(a) rejections are not necessary at this time.

Applicants also assert that the rejection of numerous ones of the dependent claims is further unsupported by the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-19100/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: October 1, 2008